

Application No. 10/586,445
Amdt. dated 18 November 2010
Reply to Office Action of 19 August 2010

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In the above-identified Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 as unpatentable over the reference to Schrems. The Examiner notes that the difference between the instant claims and Schrems is the specific heat treatment temperatures, but states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable heat treatment range in the Schrems reference.

Claims 4-7 have been rejected as unpatentable over Schrems. The Examiner states that in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable way to do the calculations in the Schrems reference in order to speed the results.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's conclusions, noting that it has cancelled original claims 1-7 and added new claims 8-13. New claims 8-13 specifically set forth the calculations necessary for Applicant's inventive method for predicting a precipitation behavior of oxygen in a silicon single crystal. Again, Applicant notes that the thermal donor concentration is not suggested or taught in the method of Schrems. As such, since the method of Schrems does not employ a thermal donor concentration, Schrems cannot achieve the accuracy of Applicant's method for predicting the behavior of oxygen in this environment. Accordingly, the laborious operation of determining the necessary conditions which result in acceptable oxygen precipitation is no longer necessary.

Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and reexamination thereof.

No further fee or petition is believed to be necessary. However, should any further fee be needed, please charge our Deposit Account No. 23-0920, and deem this paper to be the required petition.

Application No. 10/586,445
Amdt. dated 18 November 2010
Reply to Office Action of 19 August 2010

With the above amendments and remarks, this application is considered ready for allowance and applicant earnestly solicits an early notice of same. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he/she is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below listed number.

Application No. 10/586,445
Amdt. dated 18 November 2010
Reply to Office Action of 19 August 2010

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: 18 November 2010

Gerald T Shekleton
Reg. No. 27,466
Husch Blackwell Welsh Katz
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312) 655-1511
Fax: (312) 655-1501